

Appl. No. 10/620,001  
Restriction Requirement mailed September 20, 2005  
Response transmitted October 14, 2005

Applicant Docket 9046/23

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim 1-37 are pending in the Application. The Office Action requires a species restriction between what the Examiner sees as three species of inertia switches in the application. Applicants disagree with the species restriction, on the grounds that the selection of species does not include the preferred species, a magnetic inertia switch as depicted in Figs. 4-6. Claims 28-37 are directed to this species. With the Examiner's permission, Applicants elect this switch embodiment and group of claims.

2. Applicants traverse the restriction requirement, on the grounds that a reasonable number of species may be examined in a single patent application. M.P.E.P. 804.04(a). The present application has only four species, not an unreasonable number. Therefore, it would not be a burden to the Examiner to examine all the claims of the application.

3. Applicants have elected Claims 28-37 for examination, these claims corresponding to the inertia switches depicted in Figs. 4-6. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the restriction requirement and to advance Claims 1-37 to examination.

Respectfully submitted,

 14 OCT 2005

David W. Okey  
Registration No. 42,959  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200